

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,202	12/10/2003		Martin M. Liphardt	4605	
7	590	12/15/2005		EXAMINER	
JAMES D. W	ELCH		MERLINO, AMANDA H		
10328 PINEHU		E.			D. DCD 389 (DED
OMAHA, NE 68124				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2877	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·		H
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	•
Office Assis a Communication		10/731,202	LIPHARDT ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Amanda H. Merlino	2877	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ss
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this commi D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·
Status				
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10 D</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This  Since this application is in condition for allowar  closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		erits is
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposition accomposition and request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the find drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See this is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document: application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Sta	nge
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary		
3) 🔯 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 12/10/03.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate latent Application (PTO-15)	2)

## Claim Objections

Claims 1-2 objected to because of the following informalities: in claims 1-2, the variable  $\theta$ ' is not defined in the claims. All variables need to be defined in the claims even though they are defined in the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obenreder (3,857,637).

Obenreder teach of a method of investigating a sample in accordance with figure 3 which comprises a substrate (21) with a thin film coating (col 4; lines 41) with a beam of electromagnetic radiation (17) which impinges at an oblique angle of incident (col 3; lines 8-10), said method eliminating the effects of reflection from the backside of said substrate (21) (col 4; lines 23-29) by placing a shield having a hole upon the surface of the substrate wherein the incident beam (17) reflects from the surface of the substrate (17), said reflected beam having no component therein which reflected from the backside of said substrate (17) and further comprising the step of analyzing the reflected beam. Obenreder also teaches that it is well known in the art that a beam striking a surface is reflected from the top surface and from the opposed surface thereto

and that the distance between the reflected beam from the opposed surfaces depends on the angle of incident, the index of refraction of the glass and the thickness of the glass (col 4; lines 11-18).

Obenreder et al lacks the teaching of the effective radius of the hole on the shield being of a specific value as shown by the equation D  $\leq$  2T TAN ( $\theta$ ).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that even though Obenreder does not directly state the equation to calculate the effective radius of the hole on the shield, Obenreder is inherently using the equation by calculating the effective radius using trigonometry since he does teach that all the variables of the equation (angle of incident, index of the refraction of the substrate, the thickness of the substrate etc..) are needed to calculate the effective radius of the hole on the shield to block the reflections from the backside of the substrate. Examiner notes that the even though the equation is not specifically shown by Obenreder, it is inherent that Obenreder is calculating the effective radius of the hold on the shield to block the reflection from the backside of the substrate.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chandley (5,298,974) teach of a shield with a hole (figure 2) to block backside reflections.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda H Merlino whose telephone number is 571-272-2421. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory J Toatley, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Amanda H Merlino Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2877
December 8, 2005

Supervisory Patent Examiner